REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3-6, 8, 13, 22, 26, 28, 29, 36, 44, 45, 50, 52, 62, and 66 are amended and new claim 69 is added. Accordingly, claims 1-31, 33-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60-62, 66, and 69 are pending and under consideration.

Objection to Claims 8-31

The Office Action objects to claims 8-31 because of informalities. Claim 8 is amended to overcome this objection.

The Office Action also objects to claims 8-31 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 8 is amended to place claim 8 in independent form. Therefore, claim 8 does not depend on a rejected base claim.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7, 33-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60-62, and 66 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 7, 33-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60-62, and 66 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,819,550 issued to Jobs et al (hereinafter referred to as "Jobs '550") in view of U.S. Design Patent No. D489,370 also issued to Jobs et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Jobs '370"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Jobs '550 and Jobs '370, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a link hinge provided between the upper link member and the lower link member to allow the upper link member to rotate relative to the lower link member, and having a first and second hinge parts disposed on the same axis to rotatably connect upper opposite parts of the lower link member with lower opposite parts of the upper link member, respectively," as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2 and 7 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 2 and 7 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Jobs '550 and Jobs '370, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a rotation restricting part restricting a rotation of the lower link member relative to the base member within a predetermined angle range," as recited in claim 36. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 36 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

16

Serial No. 10/671,605

Claims 33-35, 37-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60, and 61 depend from claim 36 and include all of the features of claim 36. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 33-35, 37-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60, and 61 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Similarly, Jobs '550 and Jobs '370, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a first auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the base member and another end rotatably coupled to the upper link member to transmit a rotary motion from the lower link member relative to the base member to the upper link member through the link hinge; a second auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the base member and another end rotatably coupled to the link hinge to transmit a rotary motion from the lower link member relative to the base member to the upper link member through the link hinge; and another end rotatably coupled to the link hinge one end rotatably coupled to the link hinge; and a third auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the link hinge and another end rotatably coupled to the monitor main body to transmit a rotary motion from the upper link member relative to the lower link member to the monitor main body to transmit a rotary motion from the upper link member relative to the lower link member to the monitor main body to transmit a rotary motion from the upper link member relative to the lower link member to the monitor main body to transmit a rotary motion from the upper link member relative to the lower link member to the monitor main body through the link hinge," as recited in claim 62. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 62 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Similarly, Jobs '550 and Jobs '370, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "an upper auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the link hinge and another end rotatably coupled to the monitor main body to interlock with the lower auxiliary link member through the link hinge and transmit a rotary motion from the upper link member relative to the lower link member to the monitor main body through the link hinge," as recited in claim 66. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 66 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

New claim 69 depends from claim 66 and includes all of the features of claim 66. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 69 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 3-6 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Job '550 in view of Job '370, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,422,951 issued to Takahashi et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Takahashi"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Jobs '550, Jobs '370, and Takahashi, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a link hinge provided between the upper link member and

17

Serial No. 10/671,605

the lower link member to allow the upper link member to rotate relative to the lower link member, and having a first and second hinge parts disposed on the same axis to rotatably connect upper opposite parts of the lower link member with lower opposite parts of the upper link member," as recited in claim 1. Takahashi does not cure the deficiencies of Jobs '550 and Jobs '370. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 3-6 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 3-6 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Summary

Claims 1-31, 33-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60-62, 66, and 69 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 8, 2008

Bv:

Paul F. Daebeler Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor Washington, D.C. 20005 Telephone: (202) 434-1500 Facsimile: (202) 434-1501